United Nations A/C.3/70/SR.53

General Assembly
Seventieth session
Official Records

Distr.: General
13 January 2016

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 53rd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 23 November 2015, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Hilale ..... (Morocco)
later: Mr. Dempsey (Vice-Chair) ..... (Canada)

Contents

Agenda item 29: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*)

(b) Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women and of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 71: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Agenda item 72: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

Agenda item 106: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

15-20507 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda item 29: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*) (A/C.3/70/L.24/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.24/Rev.1: Improvement of the situation of women and girls in rural areas

1. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Sukhee** (Mongolia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the draft resolution had been substantially updated in the light of the productive informal consultations that had taken place among Member States. The current text reflected important current issues for rural women, including indigenous and older women. In the light of the new Sustainable Development Goal 5 on achieving gender equality and empowering women and girls, the draft resolution had been extended to girls, and the language streamlined where necessary.

3. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria, Angola, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

4. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.24/Rev.1 was adopted.*

5. **Monsignor Grech** (Observer for the Holy See) emphasized that women played an important role in sustainable development and as critical agents for change in their families and communities. His delegation was deeply concerned about discrimination against rural women and the increasing impact of climate change and conflict that disproportionately affected their ability to achieve their full potential.

6. His delegation supported the inclusion in the draft resolution of means to advance the situation of rural women through increased access to agricultural resources, food security, education, health care and political space. However, a more comprehensive approach should have been taken to certain elements, notably to strengthening the health and nutritional needs of rural women. His delegation also had some reservations about the use of expressions such as "sexual and reproductive health", "reproductive rights" and "family planning" in paragraph 2(g). Those reservations had been fully set out in the report of the International Conference on Population and Development (A/CONF.171/13/Rev.1), held in Cairo in 1994, and in the report of the Fourth World Conference on Women (A/CONF.177/20/Rev.1), held in Beijing in 1995. The use of such terminology did not create any new rights, nor did it imply that abortion was permissible as a method of family planning. His delegation also understood the term "gender" to mean male and female only, according to the customary and general usage of the term.

7. **Ms. Salim** (Libya) said that her delegation, which recognized the important contribution of rural women and their right to empowerment, integration and equal participation, had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. It did, however, have reservations about the inclusion in paragraph 2(g) of the reference to "reproductive rights", which conflicted with national legislation, the religious and moral values of Libyan society, and with Libya's social and cultural background.

8. **Mr. Elbahi** (Sudan) said that his delegation had reservations about the reference to "sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights" in paragraph 2(g).

9. **Mr. Al-Qumim** (Yemen) said that his delegation similarly had reservations about the reference to "reproductive health and reproductive rights" in paragraph 2(g).

10. **Mr. Guelaye** (Mauritania) said that his delegation also wished to register its reservations regarding the reference to "reproductive rights" in paragraph 2(g).

(b) Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women and of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly (*continued*) (A/C.3/70/L.68)

Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.68: Follow-up to the Fourth World Conference on Women and full implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the outcome of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly

11. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

12. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.68 was adopted.*

Agenda item 71: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*) (A/C.3/70/L.42, A/C.3/70/L.58)

Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.42: The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination

13. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

14. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Andorra, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Myanmar, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay and Zambia wished to join the sponsors.

15. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.42.

16. **Mr. Israeli** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that only Israelis and Palestinians could make the difficult compromises necessary to forge lasting peace or create two States for two peoples. Instead of negotiating, the Palestinian leadership continued to undermine genuine peace efforts by taking damaging unilateral steps and reaching out to Hamas, a recognized terrorist organization. Adoption of the draft resolution would encourage further unilateral steps.

17. His Government had consistently demonstrated its willingness to compromise; yet the Palestinians had still not recognized Israel as the homeland of the Jewish people or their right to live in peace and security. While it was much easier to take unilateral steps rather than engage in bilateral negotiation, such action would not benefit the Palestinian people in Ramallah, Hebron and Gaza.

18. Israel believed that all peoples had the right to self-determination. However, it would vote against the draft resolution because the solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict depended on direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. His Government called on the Palestinian leadership to stop pursuing unilateral actions and to join them at the negotiation table. Israel supported a two-State solution; however, it should be based on mutual recognition and serious security arrangements on the ground. True friends of the Palestinians and peace should not support such a one-sided draft resolution.

19. *At the request of the delegation of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.42.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon,

Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Palau, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Honduras, South Sudan, Tonga.

20. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.42 was adopted by 170 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.**

21. **Mr. Mazzeo** (Argentina) reaffirmed his country's recognition of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to form an independent, viable State. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in accordance with the Argentine Government's recognition of the State of Palestine in December 2010. That decision was intended to favour the process leading to the end of the conflict and was consistent with Argentina's firm conviction that all peoples had the right to live together. Israel should also be recognized by all and able to live in peace and security within its borders.

22. He recalled that, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the exercise of the right to self-determination required an active subject, namely a people subjected to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation, without which the right to self-determination did not exist. Welcoming the adoption of the draft resolution, his delegation hoped that it would contribute to the realization of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people, including the right to an independent Palestinian State.

23. **Ms. Rasheed** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that the overwhelming support for the draft resolution and its large number of sponsors reaffirmed the international community's unwavering support for the Palestinian people, who had lived under Israeli occupation for nearly half a century, and their right to self-determination. Moreover, that support conveyed to Israel that its distorted narratives, violations and contempt of international law had been rejected, would not be tolerated and should cease. The draft resolution, which was based on international law and the Charter of the United Nations, in no way obstructed the peaceful and fair resolution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The right to self-determination was an inalienable right of the Palestinian people and was not open to negotiation.

24. Israel's vote against the draft resolution would only further entrench the belief of the Palestinian people that Israel rejected a real peace settlement based on the existence of two States. To achieve a just peace, the right to self-determination should be mutually recognized by both parties. Israel should be reminded that the Palestinians had recognized the State of Israel over 20 years ago, and had agreed to a Palestinian State that covered only 22 per cent of historical Palestine. However, Israel had never recognized either a Palestinian State or the right of Palestinians to a State. The Prime Minister of Israel had stated on many occasions, most recently in March 2015, that a Palestinian State would never be permitted on his watch — a sentiment that continued to be voiced by many Israeli officials. The international community had shown, through its overwhelming support for the draft resolution, that it would not accept such an outcome. The Palestinian people would never forgo their inalienable human rights, including to freedom, self-determination, justice and peace.

25. Rather than denying the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination or the State of

* The delegation of Botswana subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Palestine its rightful place among the community of nations, and rejecting Palestine's peaceful, legal and diplomatic efforts to achieve peace through a two-State solution, the time had now come to hold Israel accountable to international law and the Charter of the United Nations to which it was obligated as a member of the United Nations. Israel had grossly abused the privilege of United Nations membership, a privilege that Palestine had long been wrongly denied. The occupation by Israel should be brought to an end, finally enabling the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, the independent State of Palestine with East Jerusalem as its capital, and the peaceful and secure coexistence of both Palestinians and Israelis.

Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.58: Use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination

26. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

27. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Antigua and Barbuda, Benin, the Central African Republic, Chile, the Congo, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Malaysia, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, South Africa and the United Republic of Tanzania, had joined the sponsors.

28. *Mr. Greg Dempsey (Canada), Vice-Chair, took the Chair.*

29. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.58.

30. **Mr. Reisen** (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States in explanation of vote before the voting, said that new modalities of mercenary activities could have a significant negative impact on the nature and duration of armed conflict and thus on human rights. While the European Union shared many of the concerns of the Working Group on the use of mercenaries set out in the report (A/70/330), it continued to regret the lack of conceptual clarity in the draft resolution and in the mandate of the Working Group. Private military and security companies, which could not be equated with mercenaries as defined by international humanitarian law, should therefore not be considered by the Working Group. Doing so would create confusion with the work of the open-ended intergovernmental working group, which had been entrusted to consider the possibility of elaborating a legally binding instrument on the regulation, monitoring and oversight of the activities of private military and security companies. The two distinct processes should be dealt with separately.

31. The European Union was also concerned about the inclusion in the mandate of the Working Group of the phenomenon of foreign fighters, which fell outside the purview of the draft resolution. Mercenaries were clearly defined by international humanitarian law and their activities were different to those of foreign fighters. The similarities between the two categories were not sufficient to justify amending the mandate of the Working Group. Moreover, the consideration of two very different issues under a single mandate would not contribute to resolving related human rights issues.

32. For those reasons, the European Union would, as in previous years, vote against the draft resolution. However, it would continue to participate actively with interested States in a dialogue on preventing the threat to human rights posed by mercenary activities within a more appropriate framework.

33. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.58.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint

Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Colombia, Fiji, Kenya, Mexico, Switzerland, Tonga.

34. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.58 was adopted by 121 votes to 53, with 6 abstentions.*

35. **Mr. Mazzeo** (Argentina) said that his Government fully supported the right to self-determination of peoples subjected to colonial domination and foreign occupation, in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and 2625 (XXV). He reiterated that the exercise of the right to self-determination required an active subject, namely a people subjected to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation, without which the right to self-determination did not exist. The draft resolution just adopted should be interpreted and implemented in keeping with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Committee on Decolonization.

36. **Mr. Israeli** (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that over recent weeks vicious attacks against innocent Israeli citizens perpetrated by Palestinians as a direct result of incitement by radical Islamists and terrorist elements had increased. The persistent refusal to recognize the Jewish State within any borders lay at the core of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. His Government looked forward to achieving a real, lasting peace that was based on truth and guaranteed the long-standing right of the Jewish people to live freely and securely in their ancestral homeland.

37. **Ms. Rasheed** (Observer for the State of Palestine), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said the fact that 170 Member States had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination (A/C.3/70/L.42) sent a strong message to Israel that its narrative was not the correct one. She asked whether Israel truly believed that peace would be fostered by waging three devastating wars against 1.8 million people trapped in the world's largest prison; stealing and confiscating Palestinian land and installing illegal settlers who were acting as militias and attacking Palestinians; killing, injuring and imprisoning Palestinian civilians; and violating nearly every single right of the Palestinian people.

38. Israel must understand that the continuation of its violations and occupation would serve only to fuel the anger and frustration of the Palestinian people. Despite the extreme hardships they faced, the Palestinian people would never surrender as a result of Israel's illegal policies.

Agenda item 72: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/70/L.30, A/C.3/70/L.31, A/C.3/70/L.37/Rev.1, A/C.3/70/L.43, A/C.3/70/L.48/Rev.1, A/C.3/70/L.49/Rev.1, A/C.3/70/L.51/Rev.1, A/C.3/70/L.56)

Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.30: Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order

39. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

40. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Comoros, the Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, El Salvador,

Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Malaysia, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Togo and the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the list of sponsors.

41. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.30.

42. **Mr. Reisen** (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States in explanation of vote before the voting, agreed that efforts should be made to promote a democratic and equitable international order, and that the important issues raised in the draft resolution required consideration and action by all countries. The European Union was founded on the common determination to promote peace and stability. Respect for human rights, human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality and the rule of law underpinned all aspects of its internal and foreign policies.

43. Having considered the report of the Independent Expert on the promotion of a democratic and equitable international order and the draft resolution submitted by Cuba, the European Union remained of the opinion that a number of the elements in the draft resolution went beyond the scope of the human rights agenda of the United Nations. For that reason, States members of the European Union would, as in previous years, vote against the draft resolution.

44. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.30.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Chile, Costa Rica, Lesotho, Mexico, Peru.

45. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.30 was adopted by 121 votes to 53, with 5 abstentions.*

46. **Mr. Mazzeo** (Argentina) said that his delegation was concerned about the continued abuse by some Member States of the extraterritorial application of their national legislation in blatant violation of the sovereignty of other Member States. It was particularly concerned about a dispute recognized by the United Nations where the parties involved had been expressly called on not to act in a unilateral manner pending resolution of the dispute. The extraterritorial application of national legislation in disputed areas against the sovereignty of another Member State was a violation of international law, and should be

repudiated. For that reason, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

47. **Ms. Phipps** (United States of America) said that her country, which devoted substantial resources to global development efforts, continued to have reservations about the draft resolution and its treatment of development-related issues. Her delegation had voted against the draft resolution, which inappropriately challenged the sovereign right of all States to freely conduct their economic relations and protect their legitimate national interests. The long-standing concerns of the United States about the existence of a right to development were well known. There was no agreed international understanding of the right to development, which must be made consistent with the international community's understanding of human rights.

48. The United States believed not only in allowing markets to operate but also in working with other countries to create a more favourable investment climate, rather than relying on Governments and international institutions to direct private capital. Development assistance was best used not to distribute wealth, but to assist countries in attracting private capital flows and in participating in global trade. The United States encouraged all countries to pursue an approach to development that respected human rights, involved local stakeholders, promoted transparency and accountability, and built the institutions that underpinned sustainable development.

Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.31: Strengthening United Nations action in the field of human rights through the promotion of international cooperation and the importance of non-selectivity, impartiality and objectivity

49. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

50. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Angola, Bangladesh, Belize, Colombia, Comoros, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Rwanda, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkmenistan and Uganda had joined the list of sponsors.

51. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.31 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.37/Rev.1: The right to development

52. **Ms. Moreno Guerra** (Cuba) speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, asked the Secretary of the Committee to clarify whether the draft resolution contained any programme budget implications.

53. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Secretariat was in the process of preparing a document on programme budget implications in relation to draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.37/Rev.1. It would appreciate an indication, at the earliest opportunity, of any oral revisions to the text.

54. **Ms. Moreno Guerra** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that the words "on the day before the start of" in paragraph 46 should be replaced with "in the margins of".

55. **The Chair** suggested that action on the draft resolution, as orally revised, should be postponed pending preparation by the Secretariat of the document on its programme budget implications.

56. *It was so decided.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.43: Globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of all human rights

57. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

58. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Botswana, Burkina Faso, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, the Philippines, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia and the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors.

59. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.43, as orally revised.

60. **Mr. Essam** (Egypt) asked which delegation had requested the recorded vote.

61. **The Chair** said that the recorded vote had been requested by the delegation of the United States of America.

62. **Mr. Reisen** (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the European Union attached great importance to the

globalization agenda, which should be considered in a much more comprehensive manner. Although globalization had implications for the full enjoyment of human rights, there were certain human rights and fundamental freedoms that could not be perceived as being affected by that process. The impact of globalization should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Globalization could offer means to tackle the most acute problems facing the international community, such as extreme poverty. However, the draft resolution regrettably concentrated almost exclusively on the negative aspects of globalization and failed to take note of the positive ones, and the European Union would therefore welcome a more balanced approach to the issue. It remained convinced that the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework was the best means of supporting business respect for human rights. The member States would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

63. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.43, as orally revised.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Greece, Papua New Guinea

64. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.43, as orally revised, was adopted by 128 votes to 53, with 2 abstentions.*

65. **Mr. Ríos Sánchez** (Mexico) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, as it was important to monitor human rights in the context of globalization, promote inclusive social and economic development and create the conditions necessary for poverty eradication. It would, however, have preferred the text not to have made reference to Human Rights Council resolution 26/9, since it considered the elaboration of an international legally binding instrument on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights to be premature. Insufficient information was available on national practices, experiences, successes and obstacles concerning human rights in the business context. Mexico encouraged the implementation of the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights as a valuable tool to encourage private sector respect for human rights, and would welcome their continued dissemination before a decision was taken on the need for codification.

Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.48/Rev.1: The safety of journalists and the issue of impunity

66. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

67. **Mr. Pouleas** (Greece), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, thanked all delegations for their support, flexibility and constructive engagement in producing a balanced text that reflected the concerns voiced by Governments and civil society. It was three years since the General Assembly had declared 2 November as the International Day to End Impunity for Crimes against Journalists and much more needed to be done to counter the upward trend in the number of journalists being killed and targeted. The draft resolution highlighted the need to take further steps to prevent violence, threats and attacks against journalists, and prevent the vicious cycle of impunity. It also highlighted the international community's commitment to protecting journalists against all violations and abuses of their human rights.

68. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Andorra, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, the Central African Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Peru, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka and Switzerland had joined the sponsors.

69. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.48/Rev.1 was adopted.*

70. **Ms. Mozolina** (Russian Federation) welcomed the readiness of the sponsors to engage in a dialogue and balance the interests of various States. Despite the international community's efforts, the situation with respect to ensuring the safety of journalists left much to be desired. Sometimes their rights were blatantly ignored, and at others their health and very lives were at stake. Journalists were unfortunately being included in so-called black lists, preventing them from conducting their work in some countries and their work visas were sometimes cancelled. Certain States were also continuing the shameful practice of blocking television channels. Future draft resolutions on the subject should address such issues of concern, as the safety of journalists must be a priority. However, extending the definition of journalists to include almost all those using the Internet would not facilitate an effective response. The same applied to usage of the term "media workers" in the text. The draft resolution should not be considered to apply to users of new and social media, including bloggers and users of social networks and other individuals who were not professional journalists.

Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.49/Rev.1: National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights

71. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

72. **Mr. Braun** (Germany) introduced the draft resolution through which the General Assembly, for the first time, encouraged United Nations mechanisms and processes to enhance the participation and contribution of national human rights institutions. Such institutions cut across the traditional dividing line between the State and civil society and, because of their unique status, could provide authoritative yet independent information on human rights violations and raise awareness.

73. The draft resolution recognized that the added value of national human rights institutions in the international human rights system extended beyond the Human Rights Council in Geneva. Relevant United Nations mechanisms and processes were encouraged to enhance the participation of national human rights institutions and allow for their contribution. Four New York-based United Nations mechanisms and processes in which the enhanced participation of national human rights institutions could be particularly valuable had been highlighted, namely the Commission on the Status of Women, the Conference of States Parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the Open-ended Working Group on Ageing and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including the high-level political forum.

74. The draft resolution advocated a customized approach to the participation of national human rights institutions and gave United Nations mechanisms and processes the freedom to decide on how to involve such institutions. It also recognized national human rights institutions as key players in bridging the gap between national and international human rights systems and in translating the resolutions adopted by the Committee into effective action on the ground.

75. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Andorra, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cabo Verde, Canada, the Central African Republic, Côte

d'Ivoire, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Iraq, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Norway, Palau, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the list of sponsors.

76. **Ms. Bell** (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), welcoming the draft resolution, said that the United Kingdom's domestic law prohibited reprisals or intimidation against members or staff of national human rights institutions and individuals cooperating with them. The national police force acted with autonomy from the Government in deciding where and how to investigate alleged criminal offences. The United Kingdom had three national human rights institutions with "A" status accreditation, namely the Equality and Human Rights Commission, the Scottish Human Rights Commission and the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission. They provided the United Nations with evidenced-based information and promoted the implementation of human rights norms and standards, including by supporting the universal periodic review, special procedures and treaty bodies. Strong, independent national human rights institutions were an important means of protecting international human rights standards.

77. **Ms. Morton** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Canada, France, Iceland, New Zealand and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, welcomed the open and transparent manner in which the negotiations had been conducted. The importance of supporting the participation of national human rights institutions in United Nations processes should not be underestimated, given the crucial role played by those institutions in promoting and protecting human rights at the domestic, regional and international levels: they provided valuable on-the-ground expertise and offered an independent voice on national human rights situations.

78. Enhanced engagement across United Nations mechanisms and processes would also strengthen the ability of national human rights institutions to work towards improving domestic human rights situations. The Human Rights Council in Geneva provided a best practice model for the engagement of national human rights institutions, which should be emulated, as appropriate, in the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, treaty monitoring bodies, processes related to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and other relevant United Nations mechanisms and processes. The measures provided for in the draft resolution to enhance the engagement of national human rights institutions in the United Nations should be pursued in the future.

79. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.49/Rev.1 was adopted.*

80. **Ms. Mozolina** (Russian Federation) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. National human rights institutions played an important role in the promoting and protecting human rights, and the Russian Federation supported efforts to strengthen the independence of such mechanisms. National human rights institutions should pay equal attention to monitoring legislative activities, law enforcement practices and the human rights situation regarding all population groups. Cooperation between government bodies, national human rights institutions and civil society should be further developed. States should support the activities of national human rights institutions and use them in accordance with the Paris Principles for the protection and promotion of human rights. Her delegation was confident that national human rights institutions would continue to contribute effectively to the work of the United Nations human rights mechanisms in accordance with their mandates and rules of procedure, without detriment to the intergovernmental nature of their work.

81. **Mr. Joshi** (India) said that India strongly supported the strengthening of national human rights institutions. However, certain provisions of the draft resolution were overly prescriptive on matters touching upon the nature and role of national human rights institutions — elements that were clearly set out in national legislation. The draft resolution purported to attribute definite roles, including placing national human rights institutions as an intermediary between Governments and the United Nations. Such action should be avoided, bearing in mind the unique position of those institutions in the national human rights architecture. His delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, but called for the sponsors to remain mindful of such considerations in the future.

Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.51/Rev.1: Protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons

82. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

83. **Mr. Lyngroth** (Norway), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that the text reaffirmed key human rights and humanitarian principles and expressed a common commitment to the large and growing number of persons internally displaced worldwide for a variety of reasons, including conflict and natural disasters. It also recognized the important role of the Special Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council on the human rights of internally displaced persons.

84. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Latvia, Liberia, Madagascar, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mozambique, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Somalia, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay had joined the sponsors.

85. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.51/Rev.1 was adopted.*

86. **Mr. Grant** (Canada) said that Canada was committed to ensuring that the most vulnerable people were protected and that their needs were met. Comprehensive responses were required to meet the needs of internally displaced persons, increase the resilience of host communities and address the root causes of displacement, such as conflict, persecution and discrimination, particularly in the context of protracted situations of displacement.

87. Canada welcomed the improved references in the text to protracted displacement, host communities, gender mainstreaming, resilience and communication with displaced persons, as well as language recognizing the adverse effects of climate change as contributors to environmental degradation and extreme weather events, which might contribute to human displacement. Canada, recognized that urgent action must be taken to respond to climate change — an issue of global importance and security.

88. **Mr. Elbahi** (Sudan) said that his Government was doing its utmost to protect and promote the human rights of its citizens, including internally displaced persons. His delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, but wished to reserve its position with regard to the sixteenth preambular paragraph, and disassociated itself fully from the reference to the International Criminal Court contained therein.

89. **Mr. Sargsyan** (Armenia) welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution, which sought to set out the challenges and vulnerabilities of internally displaced persons, and called upon States to take effective, practical measures to address the situation.

90. In order to strengthen the objective of the important draft resolution further, his delegation had put forward, for inclusion in the thirteenth preambular paragraph, a proposal on recognizing the universality of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and inviting States to consider ratifying the Additional Protocols thereto of 1977 as a vital international legal framework. Despite the support it had garnered and the constructive efforts of the sponsors, the proposal had regrettably been obstructed. Armenia, a traditional sponsor of the text, remained fully supportive of the draft resolution and hoped that its proposal would be reflected in a subsequent draft resolution on internally displaced persons.

Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.56: Towards the full realization of an inclusive and accessible United Nations for persons with disabilities

91. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

92. **Mr. Oh Joon** (Republic of Korea) introduced the draft resolution also on behalf of Antigua and Barbuda, Brazil, Italy, Poland and the United Republic of Tanzania. The main sponsors considered that the United Nations, which was the birthplace of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development that included disability as a cross-cutting issue, should lead by example in protecting and promoting the rights of persons with disabilities. Although the United Nations had made progress in promoting an inclusive and accessible environment, shortcomings remained, not only because of a lack of resources, but also because of the absence of a comprehensive policy.

93. The draft resolution sought to provide for a unified and comprehensive policy framework to make the working environment at the United Nations fully inclusive and accessible for persons with disabilities. It further requested the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its seventy-first session a comprehensive report on the status and application of existing regulations, facilities and services, and areas requiring improvement; best practices and views of Member States, other international organizations and relevant stakeholders; and recommendations on how to better coordinate, facilitate and monitor practical accessibility measures to provide reasonable accommodation in a cost-effective manner to meet the needs of persons with disabilities for their participation in meetings, conferences and services at United Nations premises. The report was expected to add significant value to the commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2016.

94. Noting the importance of collective engagement and close coordination in connection with the report's preparation, he welcomed the contribution of the Secretariat-wide Inter-Departmental Task Force on Accessibility, the Department of Economic and Social Affairs and the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management in promoting an inclusive and accessible environment at all United Nations premises.

95. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, the Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, South Sudan, the Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Yemen had joined the sponsors.

96. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.56 was adopted.*

Agenda item 106: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)
(A/C.3/70/L.8/Rev.1, A/C.3/70/L.13/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.8/Rev.1: Strengthening the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme, in particular its technical cooperation capacity

97. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme budget implications in accordance with rules 153 and 154 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that, to implement the activities requested in paragraph 16, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) would require additional extrabudgetary resources in the amount of $139,700 to provide for one professional post at the P-3 level for four working months and consultancy services.

98. Turning to the activities requested in paragraphs 28 and 40, he said that, in order to continue to provide technical assistance for capacity-building, UNODC would require extrabudgetary resources of $351,300 providing for one professional post at the P-3 level for 12 months, three assessment missions, two legislative drafting workshops and four capacity-building workshops.

99. Extrabudgetary resources in the amount of $187,200 would be required to hold one regional workshop on the smuggling of migrants by sea, of which $36,300 would be allocated for one professional post at the P-4 level for four months.

100. The development and launch of the first international case law database on the smuggling of migrants would require $242,400, of which $36,300 would be allocated for one professional post at the P-4 level for two months and $58,900 would be allocated for one professional post at the P-3 level for four months.

101. The activities provided for in paragraph 32 would entail extrabudgetary resources of $3,955,000 per year as well as $227,400 to provide for: one professional post at the P-4 level for 12 months; workstation and communication charges; travel; technical assistance and training activities.

102. Paragraph 43 would involve extrabudgetary resources of $1,051,800 per year to provide for: three professional posts at the P-3 level for 12 months; two meetings with drafting committees; an information technology contract to review the data collection questionnaire; software for data collection updating and adaptation; travel and one expert group meeting.

103. To implement the activities in paragraph 45, UNODC would require extrabudgetary resources in the amount of $222,700 providing for one professional post at the P-4 level.

104. In order to implement the activities in paragraph 46, UNODC would require $390,300 providing for two professional posts at the P-2 level and information technology services costs.

105. Extrabudgetary resources in the amount of $470,500, providing for two professional posts at the P-4 level and three expert group meetings, would be required for UNODC to implement the activities requested in paragraph 47.

106. As the activities would take place only if additional extrabudgetary resources were provided, adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.8/Rev.1 would not entail any additional resources under the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

107. Lastly, with regard to paragraph 8, he said that any resource requirements resulting from the General Assembly's consideration of the report of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption for the biennium 2018-2019 would be reviewed in accordance with established budgetary procedures.

108. **Mr. Lambertini** (Italy), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.8/Rev.1, said that its main purpose was to build consensus and highlight the fight against transnational crime within the broader framework of United Nations policy and action, implement and promote the universality of all relevant United Nations instruments and confirm support for the technical assistance activities of UNODC in that field.

109. The draft resolution struck a balance between the need for a coordinated, effective and global response to combat organized crime in all its forms and the need to protect the human rights of communities and victims as well as perpetrators.

110. Language had been introduced relating to the phenomenon of terrorism. The growing links, in some cases, between some forms of transnational organized crime and terrorism had been recognized, and the specific threats posed by terrorism had been addressed. The importance of strengthened international cooperation had also been stressed.

111. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, the Czech Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Peru, the Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Sudan, Spain, the Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

112. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.8/Rev.1 was adopted.*

113. **Mr. Hassani Nejad Pirkouhi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation supported the thrust and objectives of the draft resolution. However, it wished to disassociate itself from paragraph 32, which referred to the Financial Action Task Force. That entity was not affiliated with the United Nations and worked in a non-transparent and non-inclusive manner. Its establishment had not been subject to any United Nations or other intergovernmental negotiation processes and frameworks, and the decisions of the Task Force reflected biased, politicized and non-technical considerations. Furthermore, the financial prosperity of terrorist groups, such as Islamic State in Iraq and the

Levant (ISIL), indicated to a large extent the failure of the Task Force to fulfil one of its core missions, namely countering the financing of terrorism.

Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.13/Rev.1: Improving the coordination of efforts against trafficking in persons

114. **Ms. Belskaya** (Belarus), introducing the draft resolution, said that paragraphs 3 and 4 had been included in error and should be deleted from the text.

115. In adopting the United Nations Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons five years previously, the General Assembly had sent a clear and strong signal to the international community that it had the will and means to end modern slavery. Partnership, primarily among States that bore primary responsibility and leverage in the economic, social and legislative arenas for eliminating the reasons for the demand for human merchandise and destroying the criminal networks profiting from it, was an important tool in achieving that crucial goal, as was cooperation to prevent the spread of that shameful business, punish the perpetrators and restore the dignity and rights of the victims.

116. The draft resolution recognized the link between eliminating trafficking in persons and sustainable development, and focused on improving the coordination of efforts by Governments, international and non-governmental organizations, the mass media and the private sector to combat trafficking in persons.

117. An important provision concerned the holding of a high-level meeting of the General Assembly at its seventy-second session to review the implementation of the Global Plan of Action. Such a forum would provide an opportunity to consider the experience of all regions in combating trafficking in persons, foster cooperation, provide for honest and open consideration of financing of efforts in that area in the United Nations system, and confirm the political will to eradicate modern slavery.

118. The adoption of the draft resolution would make an important contribution to the coordinated efforts of States to combat trafficking in persons. The consultation process had highlighted the importance of being guided by a common objective, and of a readiness to compromise and listen to others in order to achieve a tangible result. Indeed, a readiness to view each other first and foremost as people, rather than simply as national representatives, would go a long way towards building a global partnership against modern slavery.

119. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme budget implications in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that the paragraphs to which he was referring had been renumbered in the light of the oral revision made by the delegate of Belarus.

120. Pursuant to the request contained in paragraphs 4 and 5, it was understood that the high-level meeting would be part of the General Assembly programme. As services would be covered by the meeting entitlement of the Assembly, there would be no additional meeting requirements for the proposed high-level meeting.

121. With regard to paragraphs 9 and 10, he noted that there was currently a very limited staff allocation of only two crime prevention and criminal justice officers at the P-4 level for the implementation of UNODC core mandates relating to the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Person, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, and the Global Plan of Action. As those existing regular budget staff resources were fully devoted to already mandated programme activities, no staff resources could be redeployed.

122. Noting that an extrabudgetary contribution of $600,000 in 2012 had enabled the Office to undertake a series of technical assistance and advocacy activities in connection with the Inter-Agency Coordination Group against Trafficking in Persons (ICAT) and the Global Plan of Action, he said that extrabudgetary resources in the amount of $180,300, providing for an additional programme officer at the P-3 level, would be required to continue those activities and ensure enhanced coordination.

123. In connection with paragraph 9, extrabudgetary resources would also be required to provide for two ICAT policy papers, one ICAT coordination-policy/working group meeting in Geneva and one General Assembly briefing to present the list, including travel for ICAT agencies and promotional materials.

124. In connection with the reference in paragraph 4 to "within existing means", he noted that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for

administrative and budgetary matters. As the activities would be carried out only if the extrabudgetary resources were made available, adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.13/Rev.1, as orally revised, would not entail any financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

125. Lastly, he said that Australia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Comoros, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Gambia, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Portugal, the Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Serbia, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, the United States of America and Uzbekistan had joined the sponsors.

126. **Ms. Mendelson** (United States of America) welcomed the forthcoming adoption of the draft resolution, recalling, as President Obama had noted, that the fight against human trafficking was one of the great human rights causes of the time. Trafficking in persons, which constituted modern-day slavery, a criminal act, a threat to development and a cause and symptom of instability around the world, touched many people in undetected ways, including though products manufactured using forced labour.

127. At the time of the adoption of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime in 2000, the global commitment to end trafficking had been built around the three pillars of prevention, prosecution and protection. A fourth pillar, partnership, had been added through the adoption by the General Assembly of the United Nations Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons in 2010.

128. The international community, which had recognized that it would only be possible to eradicate that form of modern slavery through collective action involving Member States, the private sector and civil society, had renewed the call to eliminate trafficking in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Sustainable Development Goal 5 on achieving gender equality and empowering all women and girls, Goal 8 on promoting sustained, inclusive and economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all, and Goal 16 on promoting peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, providing access to justice for all and building effective, accountable and inclusive institutions for all, contained targets seeking to end trafficking.

129. The United States remained committed to building a global partnership and looked forward to the high-level meeting of the General Assembly at its seventy-second session to appraise the progress achieved in the implementation of the Global Plan of Action.

130. *Draft resolution A/C.3/70/L.13/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

131. **Mr. Fawundu** (Sierra Leone), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and commended the efforts of delegation of Belarus in leading the negotiations on the text. The Group considered the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing that Convention, as the main instruments in the fight against transnational crime. He recalled the determination of African leaders in adopting a decision at the 2008 Assembly of the African Union on strengthening the cooperation between the United Nations and the African Union in combating trafficking in human beings that had been supported by the Non-Aligned Movement the following year.

132. The African Group wished to reaffirm its support for the United Nations Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons, which served not only as a coordinating mechanism for all Member States, but also as a strategic framework for the international community, including civil society, international organizations, non-governmental organizations and the private sector. The Global Plan of Action should be fully and effectively implemented if the international community was to succeed in combating trafficking in persons.

133. Cooperation and coordination were vital, and the Group emphasized the important role of the Inter-Agency Coordination Group against Trafficking in Persons. The Group was deeply concerned about the inadequate funding allocated to UNODC as coordinator in the fight against trafficking in persons, and called on Member States to step up their efforts to ensure that the Office received adequate funding from the regular budget to deliver its mandate effectively.

134. The Group was committed to working with all stakeholders to counter the threat of trafficking in persons. It supported the holding of a high-level meeting of the General Assembly at its seventy-second session to appraise the progress achieved in implementing the Global Plan of Action, and stood ready to engage actively in preparations for that event, including the modalities. The Group trusted that the participation of non-governmental organizations not in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council would be considered on a non-objection basis.

135. **Mr. Reisen** (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the elimination of human trafficking was a major political priority for the European Union. It remained strongly committed to fighting that serious crime, which constituted a gross violation of the human rights of victims and was increasingly a major feature of transnational organized crime.

136. The European Union considered the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto, notably the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, as fundamental legal instruments in the fight against human trafficking. It also attached importance to the United Nations Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons.

137. The European Union was grateful to the delegation of Belarus for submitting a draft resolution aimed at improving the coordination of efforts against trafficking in persons and noted with appreciation that its implementation would have no budgetary implications.

138. The appraisal of the Global Plan of Action should be meaningful and provide for an action-oriented assessment of gaps and challenges with the participation of all relevant stakeholders. The participation in the high-level meeting of international, regional and subregional organizations, as well as civil society, including non-governmental organizations, the private sector and the media, must to be ensured through an open and transparent accreditation procedure. The European Union, which would have preferred such language to be included in the draft resolution, hoped that those considerations would be taken into account when deciding on the modalities of the high-level meeting. It also emphasized that the meeting should be organized within existing resources.

139. **Ms. Smaila** (Nigeria) welcomed the adoption by consensus of the important draft resolution. Nigeria, a State party to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its Protocols, supported legitimate measures to combat trafficking in persons, which was a growing problem, a threat to international peace and security, and an obstacle to the attainment of fundamental human rights.

140. Concerted global action must be taken to address the root causes of trafficking in persons and the multifaceted predisposing factors. While efforts were being made to tackle the scourge in source countries, destination countries must also take steps to address issues of demand that made trafficking attractive to the criminal networks exploiting weaknesses in immigration policies. In that regard, she highlighted the importance of sharing intelligence.

141. The Committee's unity in adopting the important draft resolution sent a strong message to trafficking networks that business as usual would no longer be possible.

142. **The Chair**, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, suggested that the Committee should take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the Thirteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (A/70/90-E/2015/81) and the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime on its seventh session (A/70/407).

143. *It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.